REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim Rejections--35 U.S.C §112.

The Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for noting the claim errors, in particular the problems with the claim dependency. The Applicant has carefully reviewed each of the claims and corrected a number of §112 problems including those noted by the Examiner. It is believed that these corrections will be evident from context.

The Applicant notes that the alSafadi reference relates generally to electronic devices and accordingly has amended the claims to be consistent with the field of application of this prior art reference. The Applicant has also added apparatus claims for a device incorporating the method of the present invention.

Claim Rejections--35 U.S.C §102.

As noted by the Examiner, the alSafadi reference describes a system similar to that of the present invention in that it endeavors to simplify the upgrading of a computer device, the upgrade being either hardware or software. Nevertheless, the alSafadi reference is concerned principally with compatibility between resources not the availability of other necessary resources. Generally, the fact that two resources are compatible doesn't mean that one is required for the other one to operate. Only in two sentences at col. 5, lines 33-39, does alSafadi note that the reconfiguration manager may also provide a list of other necessary resources for a requested upgrade. No additional information is provided as to how this list is generated or determined.

In contrast, the present invention is principally addressed to determining the other necessary resources. Accordingly, the present invention differs from the alSafadi reference in three regards. First, as claimed in claims 1 and 21 of the present invention on which all other claims are dependent, the upgrading resource itself is must be linked to a list of other necessary resources. In alSafadi, the list of necessary resources is identified by a centralized reconfiguration manager. This approach creates problems with resources that are introduced after the generation of the reconfiguration manager and unknown to the reconfiguration manager and requires an impractically large reconfiguration if it is to handle all possible upgrading resources.

Second, as claimed in claims 1 and 21 of the present invention, the loader program of the present invention compares the other necessary resources with the set of resources in the upgraded device by both type and version number. The alSafadi reference considers version

numbers only with respect to <u>compatibility</u>, but does not teach making this comparison as to type and version number when determining <u>other necessary resources</u>. The difference between the <u>alSafadi</u> patent and the present invention is illustrated in claims 9 and 10 which cover methods of determining necessary resources when some resources of a type are available but they have different version numbers. The <u>alSafadi</u> reference provides no teaching as to how to treat different version numbers of other necessary resources.

Third, as claimed in claims 1 and 21 of the present invention, when less than the required resource list is available in the device, the loader employs a search strategy to find the necessary resources. The <u>alSafadi</u> reference requires or describes using a search strategy for finding other necessary resources because apparently all necessary resources are centrally located in the reconfiguration manager.

In light of these amendments and remarks, it is believed that claims 1 through 39, are now in condition for allowance and allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

REGINALD W. SPRECHER, et al.

By

Keith M. Baxter
Reg. No. 31,233
Attorney for Applicant
Quarles & Brady LLP
411 E. Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee WI 53202-4497
(414) 277-5719